

## REMARKS

This listing of claims will replace all prior versions and listings of claims in the application. Claims 1 and 39 are amended. Claims 57-60 are added. No claims are cancelled in this response. Hence, claims 1, 4-7, 10, 14-16, 19, 20, 24-26, 39-43, 46, 48-50, and 54-60 are pending. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of claims in view of the amendments and arguments.

## SPECIFICATION AMENDMENTS

Applicants amend the first paragraph of the Specification with updated information about “Related Applications.” No new matter is added by the Specification Amendments. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to enter the amendments.

## REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Examiner rejects claims 1, 4-6, 39-42, 54, and 56 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,732,176 of Stewart (hereinafter “Stewart”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,496,755 of Genty (hereinafter “Genty”), U.S. Patent No. 7,194,554 of Short (hereinafter “Short”) and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0068584 of Gage (hereinafter “Gage”);

Examiner rejects claims 7 and 43 under § 103(a) for allegedly being unpatentable over Stewart in view of Genty, Short and Gage, further in view of Funk (Funk Software, “Comprehensive RADIUS/AAA Solution for the Global Enterprise”, 2/22/2003, pp. 1-6);

Examiner rejects claim 48 under § 103(a) for allegedly being unpatentable over Stewart in view of Genty, Short and Gage, further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0055924 of Liming (hereinafter “Liming”);

Examiner rejects claims 10, 14-16, 19, 24, and 55 under § 103(a) for allegedly being unpatentable over Stewart in view of Genty, Short, Gage and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0149443 of Torvinen (hereinafter “Torvinen”);

Examiner rejects claim 20 under § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over

Stewart in view of Genty, Short, Gage and Torvinen, further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0255154 of Kwan (hereinafter “Kwan”);

Examiner rejects claims 25 and 26 under § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Stewart in view of Genty, Short, Gage and Torvinen further in view of Funk;

Examiner rejects claim 49 under § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Stewart in view of Genty, Short, Gage and Torvinen, further in view of Liming; and

Examiner rejects claim 50 under § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Stewart in view of Genty, Short, Gage and Torvinen, further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0045451 of Tan (hereinafter “Tan”).

Examiner admits that the cited references—Stewart, Short, Genty, Torvinen, Kwan, Funk, and Tan—do not disclose “periodically downloading . . . .” Office Action, p. 3. To cure this deficiency, Examiner relies on Gage. Id. at 8. The following arguments are presented with reference to claim 1. Applicants amend claim 1 and contend that Gage does not cure the deficiencies of the other references. Independent claims 10 and 39 recite similar limitations as claim 1. The claim amendments are supported by the Specification. See, for example, Application Specification, p. 10, lines 21-24; p. 13, lines 13-15.

“All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art.” M.P.E.P. § 2143.03 (emphasis added).

Applicants contend that Gage does not disclose periodically downloading, by the network switch, at regular intervals the stored second location information to an edge device, wherein the mobile client is operable to connect to the network via the edge device. Instead, Gage at best discloses “**Mobile device 26** monitors itself to determine **when to issue a location report** (step S100). Location reports can be issued periodically [by the mobile device 26] . . . .” Gage, paragraph [0064] (emphasis added). Nothing in Gage suggests that the stored second location information is periodically downloaded by

the network switch to an edge device—claim 1 clearly distinguishes a network switch from a mobile client. Therefore, Gage does not cure the deficiencies of the remaining references. Applicants also refer the Examiner to previous responses in which the above limitation is explained.

The remaining claims are cited for dependent claims only. Nevertheless, Applicants contend that they too do not cure the deficiencies of the Gage.

Torvinen allegedly discloses a method and system that allows management of restricted group access based upon credentials associated with network terminals.

Torvinen, Abstract. Paragraph [0058] of Torvinen allegedly discloses quasi-open groups whose group access criteria can be altered dynamically. However, such alteration of group access is not performed periodically at regular intervals let alone that group access being equivalent to the second location information. The only place where the term “periodically” is disclosed in Torvinen is with respect to the BSIC (Base Transceiver Station Identity Code) which is broadcast periodically by the base station on the Synchronization Channel. Torvinen, paragraphs [0038-39]. However, such periodic broadcast is not the same as periodically downloading, by the network switch, at regular intervals the stored second location information to an edge device as recited by claim 1. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to consider all words of the claim in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art, as required by M.P.E.P. § 2143.03.

Liming, allegedly discloses a software and hardware architecture operating across a local or wide area network for providing an integral spatial location context. Liming, Abstract. Liming also discloses periodically prompting a user for current spatial location if a GPS or other location determination device can not be detected. Id. at par. [0101]. However, such periodic prompting for a location is not the same as periodically downloading, by the network switch, at regular intervals the stored second location

information to an edge device as recited by claim 1. Funk allegedly discloses a RADIUS/AAA solution for global enterprise. Funk, Title. However, Funk does not disclose the method or means of periodically downloading at regular intervals the stored second location information to an edge device as recited by claim 1. Tan allegedly discloses a method and system for token based user access authentication to enable secure user access to a web server. Tan, Abstract. However, it does not disclose the method or means of periodically downloading by the network switch, at regular intervals the stored second location information to an edge device as recited by claim 1. Therefore, Liming, Funk, and Tan, alone or in combination, do not cure the deficiencies of Stewart, Genty, and Short.

Note that merely because Applicants do not specifically argue that certain limitations of a claim are not in the references is not a concession that a reference or combination of references includes the limitations. That Applicants do not contradict a particular statement made in the Office action is not a concession that applicants agree with it. Further, merely because applicants do not separately argue the patentability of every dependent claim is not a concession that there are not additional reasons for patentability of these dependent claims.

Based on the above arguments and amendments, claim 1 is not obvious by the cited references. Independent claims 10 and 39 recite similar limitations as claim 1. The remaining claims depend from independent claims 1, 10, and 39 and include all limitations of their respective independent claims.

“If an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. 103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious.” M.P.E.P. § 2143.03.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider all pending claims in view of the amendments and arguments. Applicants also respectfully

request the Examiner to call the undersigned should further clarification of the claims bring the claims to a condition for allowance.

**NEW CLAIMS**

New claims 57 and 58 depend from independent claim 1 and include all limitations of claim 1. See M.P.E.P. § 2143.03. Claims 57 and 58 are supported by the Specification. See, for example, Application Specification, p. 1 lines 10-17 (US Patent No. 7,577,996, Col. 3 lines 28 to Col. 4 line 31). Applicants contend that none of the cited references disclose a method of downloading to the mobile client or the edge device sensitive information when the mobile client is granted access to the network; and erasing the sensitive information when the mobile client or the edge device is denied access to the network.

New claims 59 and 60 depend from independent claim 1 and include all limitations of claim 1. See M.P.E.P. § 2143.03. Claims 59 and 60 are supported by the Specification. See, for example, Application Specification, p. 13, lines 13-15. Applicants contend that none of the cited references disclose a method of bypassing authenticating of the combination of identities of the user and of the mobile client of the user when the mobile client moves to another location on the network, and in response to bypassing, applying information about the other location to grant or deny access to the network for the mobile client of the user.

Applicants respectfully request consideration of new claims in view of amended claim 1 and the above arguments.

## CONCLUSION

Applicants submit that they have overcome Examiner's rejections of the claims and that they have the right to claim the invention as listed in the listing of claims. Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is believed that such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(3), Applicants request and authorize the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office to (1) treat any concurrent or future reply that requires a petition for extension of time as incorporating a petition for extension of time for the appropriate length of time and (2) charge all required fees, including extension of time fees and fees under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 and § 1.17, to Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,  
**BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP**

---

January 6, 2012

Date

---

/Usman A. Mughal/

Usman A. Mughal

Reg. No. 62,887

Attorney for Applicants

1279 Oakmead Parkway  
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040  
(503) 439-8778

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being submitted electronically via EFS Web on the date shown below.

Date: January 6, 2012

/Nicholas Weintraub/

Nicholas Weintraub